DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 658 SP 007 593

AUTHOR	Browning, Jane; Cohen, David
TITLE	Education and Social Policy: Report on a Doctoral Training Program.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 73
GRANT	OEG-0-721262
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Doctoral Programs; Educational Administration; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Educational Research; Educational Sociology; Interdisciplinary Approach; Program Development

ABSTRACT

This report seeks to (a) explain the origins and development of a research and teaching program in social policy analysis; (b) give a broad view of curricular problems in teaching social policy analysis; (c) explore changing academic priorities, away from the traditional concerns of teacher training, curricular development, and disciplinary training toward such novel and peripheral concerns as planning, policy analysis, and interdisciplinary studies in school of education; and (d) explore some problems (ambiguities in program purposes, curriculum content, and faculty and student roles) of training in social policy analysis. The report is organized historically, beginning with the origins of the program in 1966-1968. The main concerns, however, are with (a) the movement from an immature curriculum to a better developed policy analysis program, (b) the movement from a mixed (practitioner and research) training program to a research training program, and (c) the problems caused by vagueness in faculty and student roles and efforts to clarify such roles in governance and informal social relations. Six tables describing their doctoral candidate are appended. (DDO)

ED 086658

DEC 0 4 REC'D

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL POLICY:

REPORT ON A DOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAM*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Jane Browning and David Cohen
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA. 02138

October 1973

*This is the final report on NIE grant #OEG-0-721262 which supported program development and student research internships for the Education and Social Policy Program.

SP007 593

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a report on the Education and Social Policy Program (ESP), a doctoral training program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education; it is the final report under USOE grant #OEG-0-721262. The program has existed for three years and has thus far graduated four students. The report is based on documents and on interviews made in the summer of 1973, shortly after the department was merged into a new and larger program in educational administration, planning and policy analysis. It is presented in historical form.

The report has several purposes. One is to explain the origins and development of a research and teaching program in social policy analysis.* Another is to give a broad view of curricular problems in teaching social policy analysis. And another is to explore changing academic priorities in a school of education** (where there is a trend away from such central classroom and traditional concerns as teacher training, curricular development and disciplinary training, toward such novel and peripheral concerns as planning, policy analysis and interdisciplinary studies).

---

*Social policy analysis is not a social science discipline but a process in which social science methods are applied to problems of social policy.

**The report has not been produced for the program or its members, but for NIE and other interested outsiders. Thus, a good deal of history of interest chiefly to participants has been treated in rather summary fashion.

Finally, the report explores some problems of training in social policy analysis. These center on ambiguities in program purposes, curriculum content, and faculty and student roles.

This report covers four rough time periods: origins of the program (1966-68); first definitions of program structure (1969-70); the early years (1970-73); new definitions and merger (1973). But, while these periods provide the report's chief organization, our main concern is with several themes. One involves the movement from an immature curriculum to a better developed policy analysis program. A second centers on the movement from a mixed (practitioner and research) training program to a research training program. A third concerns problems caused by vagueness in faculty and student roles, and efforts to clarify roles in governance and informal social relations.

II. ORIGINS

In retrospect it seems that the chief reasons for ESP's existence was the growing sense that American schools were not performing as they should, the perception that traditional disciplinary research in education schools had not helped anticipate or ameliorate this problem, and the hope that research which was more relevant to policy might help. Harvard's first effort to grapple with this view of school problems was a large interdisciplinary

seminar devoted to a review and re-analysis of James Coleman's report on Equality of Educational Opportunity.

The seminar was organized in 1966 by Daniel P. Moynihan and Thomas Pettigrew of Harvard University. Moynihan and Pettigrew approached Dean Theodore R. Sizer of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and the three secured financial support for the seminar from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The seminar gathered sixty or more social scientists and other professionals interested in current school problems. Members came from within and outside the Harvard community, including representatives from government agencies, educational testing organizations, and the Carnegie Foundation, as well as Coleman and his colleagues. The seminar ended in 1967 with several draft papers, which (with others) were published a few years later by Professors Daniel Moynihan and Frederick Mosteller under the title On Equality of Educational Opportunity (Random House, 1972).

Christopher Jencks (of the Institute of Policy Studies in Washington, D. C. and co-author with David Reisman of The Academic Revolution) was a seminar member, and Marshall Smith (a doctoral candidate at the Graduate School of Education) was its research director. At the close of the Coleman seminar, Jencks and Smith sought to continue the work on the effects of schooling. David Cohen (former director of the U. S. Commission

on Civil Rights' study Racial Isolation in the Public Schools), joined Jencks and Smith in their effort to establish an independent research organization to investigate the effects of schooling. They wanted to create an organization which would scrutinize popular assumptions about school effects. They were particularly curious about the effects of schools on various outcomes (such as test scores and attitudes), and also the school's effect upon social and economic inequality in American society.

They succeeded in securing a three year grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York in the fall of 1968, and sponsorship from Theodore Sizer, Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The organization became part of the Graduate School of Education, and was named the Center for Educational Policy Research (CEPR). CEPR's work was focused at first on re-analysis of the Coleman survey and the long range effects of schooling, but soon broadened to include such related issues as community control, Headstart's impact, and the redistributive aspects of educational programs.

CEPR was primarily a research organization, but in the fall of 1968 held a seminar on the effects of schooling which some students at the Graduate School of Education attended. During the spring semester Dean Sizer approached the CEPR staff and asked if they would begin a program which applied the skills of social science research to problems of educational policy. Sizer wanted to move social research in the Graduate School of

Education toward a more interdisciplinary and policy-oriented approach, and he wanted to replace several weak disciplinary programs in the social sciences. Sizer thought the research at CEPR was relevant to current educational problems, and a contribution to educational policy. He hoped a new program could be organized around this beginning and renew social research in education at HGSE. The CEPR staff accepted Sizer's offer (which included assuming responsibility for an existing program in the Sociology of Education). With some reluctance, the HGSE faculty approved a planning year for a new program to be called Education and Social Policy. "The old distinction between research and practice impedes effective action and better understanding," claimed Dean Sizer. "The new program represent[s] our bet that there will be a great demand for activist researchers."

III. THE ORGANIZING YEARS (1969-1970)

The 1969-70 academic year became the organizing year for ESP. David Cohen was named director of the program, and the initial faculty included Nathan Glazer, Christopher Jencks, Stephen Michelson, Daniel Moynihan, James Teele,* Marshall Smith and Nancy St. John. No students were enrolled during that year, though the Sociology of Education students

---

*On a one-year joint appointment with the School of Public Health.

were continued.* The faculty, in organizing the new program, outlined several purposes:

1. The introduction of students to social policy analysis as a form of research in education;

2. The application of concepts and methods from the social sciences to problems of educational policy;

3. The acquisition of technical skills required to understand and conduct social science research; and

4. The preparation of students for careers in educational research and evaluation, or in the administrative careers which required these skills.

These purposes were not exactly simple or consistent. The department intended to operate a teaching program but to do it with a staff drawn largely from a non-teaching research center. The purpose was to prepare students for careers in which they could use policy analysis, but the faculty wanted to recruit not only students who would do research, but others who would use it in social action. And while the faculty did policy analysis, there is no consensus on what that was--certainly individual faculty members had different ideas on that point. Finally, the faculty's early work in 1969-70 identified five general curriculum concerns:

1. The relative importance of schools as against other institutions which socialize children;

---

*The History of Education Program was a research specialty associated with ESP. This specialty was open to a limited number of students and prepared them for research careers in colleges and universities. History of Education students were accepted with the first ESP class.

2. School's effects on the process of social stratification;

3. The relative effectiveness of different strategies for improving the education of disadvantaged children;

4. The relative importance of academic and nonacademic outcomes of schooling; and

5. The relative merits of various alternatives to existing schools.

Some tensions were evident in the faculty's first formulation of an ESP curriculum. Social Policy is not a discipline, but employs methods from all the social sciences. The faculty sought, therefore, to design a course of study that would cut across social science disciplines, and offer a variety of course content and methods of study. The result was a flexible course structure in which there would be no required courses, but students were to have specific competencies in social policy analysis. These were to include both analytic methods, and a subject area chosen by students in consultation with their advisors. The training model would be a mixture of course work and apprenticeship. Courses would be offered, but the faculty wanted students to participate in and understand the research process by working closely with faculty. It was hoped that the apprenticeship model would create a cooperative atmosphere, and help students to learn by doing. The faculty did not conceive of a teaching curriculum separate from their research, and were not particularly interested in teaching courses in the traditional teacher-provider, student-receiver manner.

The recruitment procedure involved some typical devices (an announcement in the Harvard Educational Review and other educational journals, letters to college social science departments, introducing the new department at professional meetings, and to friends of students and faculty), but there was also major recruitment effort in community action agencies. The intention was to recruit applicants of diverse interests, in order that ESP would involve minority students and those with varied experience. The students' interests were not necessarily supposed to reflect faculty interests, and the faculty sought to recruit students who by traditional standards would not be admitted to a Harvard doctoral program. The faculty saw a need to prepare practitioners who were active in service, educational change, and school reform. Both the traditional research student and the student who would use, practice, conduct, or manage educational policy analysis were to be accepted.*

---

*There was opposition to this procedure among students remaining from the doctoral program in Sociology of Education. They questioned the intentions of the ESP faculty, and argued that with one or two exceptions they had traditional research interests and chiefly analytic competencies. They did not think the faculty could help or train students interested in practitioner or service careers. The Sociology of Education students urged the faculty instead to admit students whose interest and needs were similar to the faculty's. A new program, they warned, should not try to pattern a curriculum for students with numerous concerns. The faculty did not accept the advice. Diversity in educational career aspirations was adopted as a central admission criteria.

Finally, there was the matter of governance. The proposed style for the program was loose. The faculty wanted to govern democratically, involving both students and faculty, but there was no clear definition of faculty or student power in decision making. Nor was there any discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of an academic program whose governance was determined by student and faculty participation. Many issues were avoided by an informal decision-making style and a desire for much discussion and consensus.

Conclusion

The organizing year was ambiguous. It ended with a new curriculum and a promising class of students, but with varied notions of program purpose, and unclarity about governance. During the next three years, ESP developed from a loosely structured program for training practitioners and researchers to a more highly structured research training program in a larger area training administrators.

IV. THE PROGRAM'S EARLY YEARS (1970-73)

The first class of students arrived in the fall of 1970, and the academic year seemed a promising one. ESP was to be a key element in the redirection of the Graduate School of Education. The faculty had grown considerably,

with the addition of several members: James Breeden (a former community leader in Roxbury), Herbert Gintis (an economist interested in school's non-cognitive outcomes), Barbara L. Heyns (a sociologist studying the effects of tracking), David Kirp and Mark Yudof (attorneys interested in law and education), and Marvin Lazerson (an historian of urban education). Henry Acland, a visiting CEPR Fellow, was at work on a study of school effects in Britain. The seventeen new students met the expected diverse qualifications--they were an energetic group with many ideas for research and practice (see Appendix).

During orientation week students were given a program description which read as follows:

> "The program in Education and Social Policy seeks to train men and women both to understand American education and to change it. Students will be expected to become familiar with the main policy issues in education, and with the institutions and interest groups that affect policy.
>
> Although the program places no restrictions on the range of issues to which students can address themselves, faculty in the program are deeply involved in such matters as integration, community control, compensatory education, tracking, pre-schooling, open admission to college, and the relationship of schooling to the job market. Students will be expected to learn something about the research evidence regarding these issues, and the political and social processes by which the issues have sometimes been resolved."

This statement suggested ESP was a diverse and flexible program--a program for training practitioners and researchers to "understand American education and to change it." The statement spoke directly to

current educational problems, and emphasized the importance of knowing the research evidence and political and social processes associated with those problems.

The curriculum offered general requirements (competence in analytic methods, mastery of a particular problem area, and knowledge of a discipline) that could be met in any manner mutually satisfactory to the student and his advisor. The faculty offered several courses designed to provide the required skills and students were expected to either take these courses, propose an alternative way of acquiring them, or demonstrate that they already had them.

During the first year, students took four half courses given by the ESP faculty:

1) An introduction to major policy issues, designed so the student became acquainted with the issues and the work of the faculty;

2) A course on the relationship between research and policy;

3) A course which examined in some detail the political, economic, and social forces which affected the initiation, implementation, and evaluation of specific educational programs;

4) A task force which tackled a single educational problem in order to advise alternative solutions--in effect, a policy analysis practicum.

In addition, first year students were expected to take two half courses in statistics, which the faculty considered a requirement for literacy in social research.*

As the year passed, students interested in service careers became increasingly dissatisfied with the curriculum and course content. Most of the classes seemed to be void of practitioner concerns, and many students felt overlooked and often humiliated. They questioned the relevance of the courses, and the program's promise of relevance for practitioners as well as researchers. Several of these students also were unhappy and uneasy with the research courses, and several dropped the statistics course not long after the semester began. The faculty began to doubt whether all the students with an interest in service and community action would do the work required to achieve literacy in research methods.

---

*Other ESP courses offered were:

Law and Education
Education and Public Policy
School and Community
The Right to an Education: Legal and Social Perspectives
Perspectives on Equality of Educational Opportunity
Urban Social Policy
American Capitalism: Conflict and Power
Schooling and Social Stratification
Seminar on the Sociology of Education
Issues in the Sociology of Education
Issues in Social Policy
Community Development, Education and the Public School
Design and Analysis of Natural Experiments

In addition there were problems with the practicum. It was an applied course following the apprenticeship model outlined during the organizing year, and in the first year it involved a study of the feasibility of alternative approaches to consumer protection in education, supported by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. It was a large project, with an enormous amount of work, and students were paid as research assistants and received course credit. The course was enormously time consuming; while it had been intended for the spring semester only, it lasted through the summer, and it still left a great deal of work to be done by the faculty. Practicum training involved more work than anyone had anticipated, and it required more work than most students were willing or able to do.

By the end of the year, it was obvious to faculty and students that a training program with diverse points of view aimed at students interested in practitioner and research careers was difficult to achieve. The faculty began to question the fit between research work and teaching requirements, and their ability to train research and service students.

These uncertainties were compounded by two areas of role confusion within ESP: one centered on social involvement in the program, and the other on political involvement. From a social point of view, students had come to ESP for various reasons. They wanted to learn about the educational process, they wanted credentials, and they wanted training. Many wanted to become

qualified to render community service and some sought an activist program where one could be introduced to really revolutionary educational practice. Many wanted several of these things, and some wanted all of them. The tensions this produced probably only exacerbated the students' problems in defining their role in the university. Many were lost and some were detached or hostile to the new environment. They questioned their purposes for being in graduate school, and were unsure what their individual expertise should be. In response, some students sought to develop a sense of community at ESP, to build a communal program where students and faculty could share personal and academic experiences.*

A large amount of time was spent trying to define and attain community. Memos and posters were addressed to the "ESP Community." End of the week teas and occasional community dinners were held for faculty, staff and students. Faculty and students organized sandwich seminars, and colloquia at which students presented their research. Students were eager for the community to develop, and invited faculty to join community activities. Faculty were not eager to participate in social gatherings though; they had little need

---

*The location of the program encouraged the idea of community. ESP was housed in a quaint wooden frame three-story house typical of the Cambridge residential area, at twenty-four Garden Street. Twenty-four Garden Street was away from the main HGSE campus, it was open at all hours to faculty and students, and its facilities were available for social affairs. No other program was located in the building. (For a time, twenty-four Garden Street became a center for the undergraduate strike on the Vietnam War, in which a number of the ESP students became involved.)

for the type of social community desired by the students--many had families, and others had previous experiences with the search for community and had found it less than satisfactory. Early faculty attendance at community affairs was representative, but as time passed it decreased. The faculty wanted a community, but a different one than the students--they wanted one structured chiefly around academic work. And some of the first year students, like the faculty, were not interested in developing a community for sharing personal and social needs. These students began to move away from social activities and departmental meetings that did not reflect their individual academic interests. They worked on their own research priorities, and ESP became their academic community. All of this accentuated the distance among students and between some students and faculty. There was no student consensus, even on social needs.*

These ambiguities about social roles and program purposes were compounded by the program's governance. Departmental decisions were made in a generally loose and informal way, with no clear division of power--even though the faculty was perceived by most to be in charge. Students were unwilling to press hard on these issues, because many of them desired

---

*For instance, black students in the program had established a separate community to meet their particular needs. They were disappointed with what they defined as ESP's misrepresentation of the black educational and social problems in America, and because of cultural differences found the general Harvard community gatherings alienating.

close and informal contact with faculty; faculty were unwilling to draw clear lines both because they cherished the idea of democracy and the notion of close and informal relations with students, and because many were uneasy with traditional faculty authority.

The effects of this ambiguity were evident in the arrangements made to choose the second class. The admissions committee was comprised, by consensus, of an equal number of faculty and students, with each member having a vote. The faculty members on the committee were chosen by the ESP faculty, and the student members were chosen by the ESP student body, from student volunteers.

The significance of the admissions process (other than its representing the democratic ethos of the program) was that the criteria used for accepting applicants were exactly those used for the first class. The criteria included diversity among students (practitioners and researchers), experience in the "real" world, or experience with the analysis of policy questions. The egalitarian notion of accepting students who might not ordinarily be accepted into a doctoral program was continued. And some members of the committee were concerned as well with the applicants' political orientations.

But despite a commitment to diversity, by the time the admissions committee was established it was clear to all that many students felt the program was not providing adequate resources for service-oriented students,

and that diversity among students was straining the curriculum. The admission process in the second year disregarded these facts, as it had disregarded the Sociology of Education students' admonitions on this point the year before. A second class of students much like the first class was accepted.

The reasons for this varied. Some students hoped they could redefine the program by admitting more students interested in practice and community action. Some faculty hoped the program would settle down into the expected mold, and others hoped the problem would go away, somehow, with time. And many students and faculty simply tried to ignore the conflict, because they did not want to challenge either the idea of democracy or the notion of diversity among students. As a result, the gathering problems of the program's first year were simply carried forward into the second.

Year Two

The ESP program's second year* thus began under several clouds. In addition to uncertainties about curriculum and admissions, the federal fellowship program (under Title IV of the ESEA) which had supported ESP students had been cut, which meant that further support for the program

*It was at the outset of this year that James Breeden assumed direction of the program.

would depend on new fund-raising efforts. Student aid, of course, was a category of money increasingly hard to come by in the late 1960's and early 1970's. One alternative was to raise more research money and support students as research assistants, but that was particularly difficult for a faculty already up to its ears in research commitments. These difficulties simmered throughout the first semester, and as the new year began the faculty began more intensive discussions of the program and possible directions. As these progressed, agreement seemed to emerge on several points:

1) The faculty had not given students clear enough signals about its expectations, either concerning the sorts of work students ought to be doing or the evaluative criteria the faculty would apply.

2) The faculty had not given clear signals because it had conflicting expectations.

3) There seemed to be agreement that the teaching had been uneven and that there were several things students should learn which they were not presently being helped to learn.

Faculty and students knew that several students had not taken all of the courses suggested as basic competence areas, and that there were quite a few students in the program who had never worked closely with any of the faculty. This increasingly disturbed the faculty. Departmental discussions focused a good deal on what should be done for students interested in practitioner careers. One notion was that ESP not accept any students uninterested

in analytic work; another was to admit practitioner students to a special program in administration, and a third notion was to redesign the curriculum. It was decided that the curriculum would be redesigned.

A curriculum committee was organized early in the second semester, with the task of reworking the curriculum to meet both practitioner and research training requirements. The committee consisted of three students and one faculty member. The students volunteered for the committee,* which worked for several months into the early spring. The draft report began with a statement of constraints on fashioning a common curriculum in the field of social policy:

> "(Social Policy) is not an academic discipline, nor is it a practicing profession. This means that there is no ready answer to how to study and do social policy. Another difficulty in determining a common curriculum is the commitment in the ESP program to diversity, and a suspicion of authoritarianism in education (e.g. requirements).
>
> These constraints . . . lead us to agreement that the ESP program could not and should not be viewed as training for particular roles. Rather, it is a variety of agendas. Moreover, had we decided otherwise, there would have been the insoluable problem of choosing which roles to train for. This problem is not so easily disposed of, however, we have to be sensitive to

---

*There was a problem with the committee membership. All of the students who volunteered to work on the committee defined themselves as researchers. The committee did not have a permanent working member representing practitioner concerns, even though there was a serious effort to recruit several. Members of the program questioned both the seriousness of students interested in practitioner careers and the quality of the final curriculum report if void of practitioner representation.

> hidden and unintended agendas. It is important that a variety of experiences and approaches be visible and accessible to students, lest the special interest of faculty members and the limited availability of resources become powerful channeling devices."

The committee proposed several first year core courses offering all students a common exposure to education and social policy. The core program was to accomplish three tasks. The first was to address the major policy questions in education, which involved sorting out issues and examining the premises. The second was to ground students in policy analysis in education, focusing especially on the development, implementation, values and outcomes of policies. The third was to develop the analytic and methodological skills necessary to pursue social policy analysis. The core program included an introductory seminar in education and social policy, a course in comparative social policy, a statistics course, and a practicum in analytic writing. For the second and third years of doctoral study, three courses were to be required for all doctoral students; two with traditional social science disciplinary focus and one dealing with policy analysis. Courses related to specific social policy topics or analytic methods were left for student electives.

Reaction to the draft report was not overwhelming, but it was not negative either. It appeared that students were satisfied with the courses

suggested, although there were objections to the writing course.* There was, however, no real probing of the fact that the proposed curriculum was heavily weighted in favor of analytic work, nor much serious discussion of the report. While the faculty and some students were pleased with the report, there was some distress at the relatively modest interest in it.

Simultaneous with the reworked curriculum was the admissions process for the third ESP class (1972-73). Since the program was seeking to define its future, the admission outcome would be crucial; students accepted for the following year would reflect possible program direction. It was decided (with some reservations among faculty) that the admissions committee would consist of four faculty and four students. At first, five students volunteered, four blacks and one white. The white student and one black resigned leaving three black students.** At this point, the lack of white students on the committee disturbed some program members. After some discussion another volunteered.

---

*Many students considered research papers the necessary writing exercise and regarded any other writing requirement beyond the qualifying paper and thesis unwarranted (the qualifying paper is a second year research requirement for all doctoral candidates at HGSE).

**Students were busy with academic work and the admission's process required an enormous amount of time.

The admission process concluded with fifteen acceptances. Of these, one was American Indian, five were Afro Americans, one was Chinese, one was Japanese, one was Puerto Rican, and six were white. The applicant pool had been excellent, and minority students in the program were content with the outcome. They saw ESP in great need for a pluralistic approach to education, and thus wanted a substantial population of students of various racial and ethnic backgrounds.

The result was controversial. Part of the problem rested with Ed. M. students in residence who had not been accepted, and part with faculty who thought some of the students accepted were probably not interested in the proposed new curriculum. Minority students in the program tended to regard the reactions as racist; the result was several difficult meetings and a good deal of bitter feeling on all sides.

There were some important implications of the admission process. One was that the career interests of the black and white students had been arbitrarily divided; blacks were identified as practitioners and whites as researchers. While there was some truth to this, many students crossed these lines. But in many minds the problem of "practitioners" had become a racial problem.

Another implication concerned faculty reaction. The admissions process and ensuing discussion, and the lack of broad interest in curriculum revision had produced a growing consensus that research and service could

not be satisfactorily combined in the ESP program. As a result, the faculty began exploring a merger with the Administrative Career Program, in an effort to collaborate with a faculty which could provide practitioner training. The discussions proved fruitful, and a merger plan was worked out for a larger practitioner program and several small research training programs. The merger, however, had been planned by ESP and ACP faculty without the knowledge or participation of students. When the draft proposal was circulated in late May, it met with vigorous opposition from students in the existing ACP and ESP programs (who were outraged at the absence of participation, and the secrecy of the proceedings), as well as from some faculty.

The merger proposed was not successful. ESP students called for a "moratorium on any further action and planning concerning a proposed merger between ACP and ESP," and the Harvard Graduate School of Education faculty agreed. All concerned were persuaded that a merger was untimely and should be discussed in the fall.

If the merger proposal and ensuing postponement suggested that there were deep divisions within the program, other developments also reflected this. By the end of the program's second year there was little interest in making ESP a "community" which extended beyond academic concerns. In part this was due to the program's move out of twenty-four Garden Street into the new Gutman Library--a much larger and less homey building,

containing other programs and facilities. A second reason was the fact that students and faculty had moved outside of ESP in many respects. Students with analytic interests had found apprenticeships with ESP faculty, or in CEPR, or in research organizations outside the University in which ESP faculty were involved--the Huron Institute, the Cambridge Institute, or the Center for the Study of Public Policy. Other students had found work at the Harvard Center for Law and Education, and several interested in community action had become involved in Roxbury organizations such as the Joint Center or the Roxbury Community Schools Federation.

Finally, by the end of the program's second year many students were more concerned about finishing theses and finding jobs than in defining a new community. By and large they have been quite successful--either because of the program or in spite of it. One is Staff Associate to the University of Massachusetts' Vice-President for Policy, another works in the Rand Corporation's Education and Human Resources research program, several have worked as analysts in the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs, one is an Assistant Professor of Black Studies at Brandeis University, another is a staff associate with the Education Staff Seminar in Washington, and several are working on research projects at the Huron Institute and the Center for the Study of Public Policy.

Thus, the program's second year saw movement toward a more structured curriculum, an abortive attempt to resolve the research-practice problem, and the end of efforts to create an ESP community. By the end of May tensions were higher than ever before; the faculty was determined to give the program more structure, and a clearer analytic orientation, but it was not clear whether or how this could be accomplished.

Year Three

One important novelty in the ESP program's third year was the cast of characters: the School had a new Dean--Paul Ylvisaker--and the program had two new faculty members--Sara Lawrence Lightfoot and Joseph Featherstone. The Dean was a former professor of government, foundation executive, and community affairs commissioner in New Jersey, with a strong interest in training urban administrators. Sara Lightfoot--a sociologist educated at Swathmore and HGSE--had done observational research on students and teachers. Jay Featherstone--an historian and editor of the New Republic, had written extensively on the open education movement and on school reform in America.

Not long after the semester began, the Dean made clear his commitment to a three-way merger in the Administrative area--including the ESP and Administrative Career Program, and the program in Educational Planning. The

first semester and half of the second were occupied with various meetings and task forces designed to explore the possibility of such an arrangement. The ESP students' opposition to it continued, and before the fall semester was very far along, the ESP faculty concluded that they would prefer to continue the program's development outside the framework of any merger.

The reason for this lay in the other novelty of the new academic year--the fruition of past efforts at curriculum improvement. A new introductory social policy course was taught by two members of the faculty, a new advanced course in policy analysis was going to be offered, and a seminar on ethics and social policy also was to be offered for the first time. All three courses had developed directly from the work of the curriculum committee more than a year earlier. In addition, several other courses had been overhauled in ways suggested by the curriculum committee. There were still problems with several of the courses, but the faculty felt quite strongly that their efforts to develop a policy analysis curriculum was out of the woods. Although it was apparent that more work would be required to bring the curriculum to maturity, there was a strong feeling that the effort would be worthwhile.

Oddly enough, then, the faculty's morale and commitment to the program was growing, despite the evident movement toward merger and the unhappy events of the preceding spring. This development continued during the year,

and was little affected by the Dean's declaration, midway in the second semester, that ESP would not survive unless it merged with the other two programs. The proposal which was worked out as a result of this announcement envisioned a large practitioner training program, with modest research programs in planning, social policy, and organizational behavior. While neither students nor faculty in ESP were happy with the result, they saw no way to effectively challenge the Dean's determination to merge the programs.

Since the merger contemplated the continuance of ESP as a research training program in policy analysis, the admissions process went forward in the spring of 1973. This time the entire full-time faculty (six) sat on the committee, and was joined by an equal number of ESP students. Fourteen students were admitted, as fully diverse a group as the year before, but the process left no visible acrimony or bitterness. One difference was that the existence of the new practitioner program meant that ESP would accept only students with an orientation to analytic work. The general sense that this issue was more or less settled probably helped account for the smoothness of the admissions process, and the faculty's determination to develop a viable program for students interested in research and analysis also had an effect. As a result, while student representation on the admissions committee had not changed, the sense that the faculty was in control of the program was more pronounced.

By the end of the third year of the program, then, several issues seemed to be moving toward resolution. The merger had effectively defined ESP as a program for policy analysts; the program continued to seek a diverse student body interested in a variety of analytic roles, but it sought students interested primarily in analysis. In addition, earlier work on curriculum development had begun to pay off. By the end of the third year a good deal of feedback on new courses had been collected, and a clearer sense of a core curriculum had emerged. The faculty's commitment to the program and curriculum development continued to grow.

Several decisions flowed from all this. One was to break the introductory course dealing with social policy in education into two semesters: the first dealing with the policy system in education, and the second dealing with substantive issues in social policy. A second was to teach the introductory course collectively, on the grounds that this would not only improve the course, but would also help develop program cohesiveness. A third decision was to enforce core curriculum requirements--which included the two introductory courses, two semesters of statistics, several other courses in social policy to be selected by students, and a course concentration in one social science discipline.

These decisions were carried into effect during the fall of the program's fourth year (when this report was completed). Although it is not clear just

what ESP's future will be at HGSE, after three years it had moved closer to becoming a viable policy analysis program.

CONCLUSION

It is tempting to draw lessons from this experience, but it is not easy to decide what they might be, or which is most important. One plausible candidate concerns curriculum in policy analysis programs. Several reasonable approaches exist: Harvard's Kennedy School has adopted a strongly methodological approach--emphasizing training in analytic techniques thought to be useful in various substantive policy areas; the Public Policy program at Berkeley appears to more or less share this view. Stanford's Graduate School of Education, by contrast, offers training in policy analysis as a modest course concentration for second year doctoral students whose main academic work lies elsewhere. Or, to take other examples, analytic training also can be secured in a disciplinary mode in policy-oriented departments of economics (Harvard or Berkeley, for example), or politics (MIT, for example).

The Education and Social Policy Program at HGSE has evolved a mixed approach. The core courses offered by ESP faculty focus on matters central to the analysis of social policy in education: the structured dynamics of the policy system; the evolution and main themes of social policy in education; and the structure of policy analysis itself. The curriculum also requires

methodological competence, but it does so by requiring a working familiarity both with statistics and research methods, and with the conceptual and methodological apparatus of one major social research discipline concerned with education. In effect, the program seeks to deal with what is unique in social policy analysis in its core courses, and to recognize the reliance on disciplines for methods and research traditions by also requiring a substantial base in one of them. What distinguishes policy analysis from disciplinary research on this view, then, is its applied character (the interdependence of inquiry and the policy process), rather than any unique research methodology. Time will tell if these ideas make sense.

Another lesson might concern how graduate schools of education ought to teach social research in education. The body of this report suggests that in creating ESP, HGSE tried to reorganize traditional training programs oriented to disciplines (sociology of education, etc.) so that research would be more oriented to professional needs. In this case, the School was of the opinion that the important professional needs were for research that was relevant to major current social problems.

In a certain sense that reorientation was reasonable, because professional schools are places where knowledge ought to be applied to social needs. On the other hand, professional needs have a way of changing every few years. In the fifties, researchers had taught doctoral candidates in administration,

on the theory that administrators needed the best possible scientific knowledge to prepare them for action. Not too many years later the school decided that the earlier organization of social research in education should be replaced by disciplinary research programs designed to produce high quality knowledge by training basic researchers not administrators, on the theory that research in education needed to be vastly improved. Not long after ESP was organized, considerable sentiment began to develop to the effect that the chief professional need was for social research relevant to the needs of educational administrators. On the basis of this idea (among others), ESP was merged with training programs in educational administration and planning.

Each of these may be a reasonable interpretation of professional needs, but the tendency for ideas to change every few years has had a de-stabilizing effect on research training in education at HGSE. It certainly has not enabled researchers to develop substantial traditions and cumulative experience in training educational practitioners. This sort of change may be unavoidable in a profession with a relatively weak and thus constantly shifting conception of good professional practice and knowledge. Despite the desire for somewhat greater stability in teaching social research and in research training, there may be no satisfactory way for education schools to meet the conflicting demands of working in an applied setting, achieving accepted disciplinary

standards of good research, and of responding to changes which regularly sweep through education. Instability may be an enduring feature in these environments.

Finally, it might be reasonable to look for lessons about problems of role ambiguity. Certainly the experience of the program in Education and Social Policy evokes some fairly common themes in the recent experience of minority students in universities: the program was ill-prepared for the minority students it had sought out, and it had done the seeking in often unwise ways. There was an unwillingness to recognize the limitations of the program, until a good deal of damage had been done on all sides. The lessons have been painful ones, and while there has been a good deal of useful learning about what the program can and cannot do, the price paid by many individuals has sometimes been considerable.

Equally important, the experience with democratic governance suggests that this notion is much more complex than had been assumed. Democracy often was a convenient way for faculty who were unsure of their own academic roles to blur the real distinctions between themselves and students, to obscure real differences in situations, and sometimes to hide real conflicts. Once events drove things to the point that these confusions could no longer be maintained, the faculty was unwilling to continue saying that it would share authority

on a perfectly equal basis with students. Many of these issues have not yet been fully confronted, but some of the veils have begun to fall away.

Another lesson might be drawn--and no doubt will be. Many students and faculty in the program disagree about the interpretations mentioned here, and if the program still exists in another three years, no doubt many of the issues will have changed. But these three areas, at any rate, seem to us at least the proper points on which moralizing about ESP's experience ought to begin.

APPENDIX

Table I.
Age Distribution

	Class 1 (1970)	Class 2 (1971)	Class 3 (1972)	Class 4 (1973)
20 - 25	8	4	9	1
26 - 30	7	2	1	8
31 - 35	1	1	2	2
Over 35	1	-	1	-
	17	7	13	11

Table II.
Predominant Ethnic Background

	Class 1 (1970)	Class 2 (1971)	Class 3 (1972)	Class 4 (1973)
Afro American	4	4	3	2
American Indian	--	-	1	-
Caucasian	13	3	5	6
Chinese American	--	-	1	-
Foreign	--	-	1	2
Japanese American	--	-	1	-
Puerto Rican	--	-	1	1
	17	7	13	11

Table III.
Test Score Medians
Graduate Record Examinations

	ESP Verbal - Quantitative	All Doctoral Programs Verbal - Quantitative
Class 1 (1970)	690 - 630 (N = 9)	640 - 610 (N = 56)
Class 2 (1971)	570 - 640 (N = 1)	570 - 580 (N = 62)
Class 3 (1972)	580 - 660 (N = 8)	580 - 590 (N = 46)
Class 4 (1973)	690 - 620 (N = 5)	670 - 610 (N = 37)

Table IV.
Test Score Medians
Miller Analogies Test

	ESP	All Doctoral Programs
Class 1 (1970)	79 (N = 6)	68 (N = 75)
Class 2 (1971)	50 (N = 5)	62 (N = 114)
Class 3 (1972)	65 (N = 7)	66 (N = 62)
Class 4 (1973)	71 (N = 5)	65 (N = 44)

Table V.
Academic Distribution

Class (Year)	Institution	B.A.	M.A.
1 (1970)	Antioch College	1	-
	Boston University	-	1
	Chatham College	1	
	Chicago, University of	1	-
	Columbia University	1	2
	Connecticut, University of	-	1
	Dartmouth College	2	-
	Douglass College	1	-
	Earlham College	1	-
	Harvard College	1	
	Harvard Graduate School of Education	-	3
	Indiana University	-	1
	John Hopkins University	-	1
	Michigan, University of	-	1
	New York School of Social Work	-	1
	Oklahoma, University of	1	-
	Pittsburgh, University of	1	-
	Princeton, University of	1	-
	Providence College	1	-
	Smith College	1	-
	South Methodist University	1	-
	Syracuse University	-	1
	West Virginia University	1	-
	Wisconsin, University of	-	1
	York University	1	1
		17	15
2 (1971)	California, University of at Los Angeles	1	-
	Catholic University	-	1
	Columbia University	1	2
	Emory University	-	1
	Florida, University of	1	-
	Harvard Graduate School of Education	-	3

Table V (Cont.).
Academic Distribution

Class (Year)	Institution	B. A.	M. A.
2 (1971) Cont.	Michigan, University of	1	-
	Morgan State College	1	-
	Oberlin College	1	-
	Spelman College	1	-
		7	7
3 (1972)	Brooklyn College	-	1
	California Univ. of Los Angeles	1	-
	Columbia University	1	-
	Hampton Institute	1	-
	Harvard Graduate School of Education	-	9
	Hunter College	1	-
	Michigan, University of	2	-
	Middlebury College	1	-
	Millsaps College	1	-
	Northwestern University	1	-
	Queens College	1	-
	Stanford University	1	-
	Toronto, University of	1	-
	Wheaton College	1	-
		13	10
4 (1973)	Boston University	1	-
	Brooklyn College	1	-
	Chicago, University of	1	-
	Florida, University of	1	-
	Hampton Institute	1	-
	Harvard College	1	-
	Harvard Graduate School of Education	-	7
	Harvard Graduate School of Government	-	1
	Harvard University	1	-

Table V (Cont.).
Academic Distribution

Class (Year)	Institution	B.A.	M.A.
4 (1973) Cont.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	-	1
	New York, State University at Buffalo	1	-
	North Carolina, University of	-	1
	Syracuse University	1	-
	Texas, University of	-	1
	Tufts University	-	1
		9	12
	No Degree	2	-
		11	12

Table VI.
Geographical Distribution
(from permanent address cited on application)

Class 1 (1970)		Class 2 (1971)	
Connecticut	2	California	1
District of Columbia	2	District of Columbia	2
Massachusetts	2	Georgia	1
Mississippi	1	Massachusetts	1
New Jersey	2	Michigan	1
New York	3	New York	1
Oklahoma	1		
Pennsylvania	1		
Rhode Island	1		
Virginia	2		
	17		7

Class 3 (1972)		Class 4 (1973)	
California	2	Canada	1
District of Columbia	1	District of Columbia	1
Massachusetts	2	Massachusetts	7
Michigan	1	Missouri	1
Mississippi	1	North Carolina	1
New York	4		
Oregon	1		
Canada	1		
	13		11